Date: Wed, 2 Jun 93 12:05:56 PDT
From: Info-Hams Mailing List and Newsgroup <info-hams@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Info-Hams-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Info-Hams Digest V93 #671
To: Info-Hams

Info-Hams Digest   Wed, 2 Jun 93   Volume 93 : Issue 671

Today's Topics:

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Info-Hams-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Info-Hams Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/info-hams".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Wed, 2 Jun 1993 16:15:52 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!gatech!kd4nc!
ke4zv!gary@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Best Mobile Dual-Band Rig?
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <feustelC7ywut.CGu@netcom.com> feustel@netcom.com (David Feustel)
writes:
>I'm thinking about getting a mobile dual band (144/440) rig for my car
>and I'm looking for input about units from major manufacturers from
>people who are using them already.I lean towards ICOM since I'm
>pleased with the performance of my W2A. Opinions Please?

After looking over the field, I'm using Alinco 570 and 590 rigs

for dual band mobile operation. They have a low price and good
performance. I like the 570 a bit better, adequate heatsink and
no fan, built in duplexer, plus a better control layout. If you
need split antennas, or a remote head, the 590 is better. Note
590s are cheap since the 599 and 600 both supercede them without
offering substantial improvements.

I also like the Yaesu dual banders. The Icoms seem awkward in
control function, and much over priced. I haven't heard anything
bad about their performance, however, I'm just at the age where
big displays and big well separated controls are becoming important.
The less said about the Kenwood coffee warmers the better. A friend's
731 just ate another PA module even though he fitted an outboard fan
to it. Standard is an up and comer with some nifty features, but it's
also rather dear. There's no need to spend over $500 for a competent
dual band rig.

Gary
--
Gary Coffman KE4ZV | You make it, | gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems | we break it. | uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way | Guaranteed! | emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244 | |

Date: Wed, 2 Jun 1993 17:59:53 GMT
From: swrinde!cs.utexas.edu!uwm.edu!ux1.cso.uiuc.edu!uchinews!
hayward@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Call Sign Server, Where?
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <1uibpd$ci4@fugu.mc.com> levine@mc.com (Bob Levine) writes:
:
:I tried the 2 servers listed and they worked fine, however the databases
:are way out of date. Dec 1991 I think they both were. I got this call
:in the mail on Jan 14, 1992 and it was not listed in either.
:
:callbook@sat.datapoint.com
:callsign.cs.buffalo.edu 2000
:
:Bob KD1GG

Something is strange here. Buffalo was updated a year ago spring.

Here is your listing that Buffalo gave me a few minutes ago:

```
% telnet electra.cs.buffalo.edu 2000
Trying 128.205.32.2 ...
Connected to electra.cs.buffalo.edu.
Escape character is '^]'.
Callbook v1.3  Bug reports to bowen@cs.buffalo.edu  Type 'help' for help
>> call kd1gg
Call-Sign: KD1GG                    Class: ADVANCED
Previously: KA1JFP                  Class: GENERAL
Real Name: ROBERT A LEVINE          Birthday: JAN 17, 1957

and so on.....
```

```
--
------------------------------------------------------------------------
Kristin R. Hayward                University of Maine               WX9T
kristin@gandalf.umcs.maine.edu  (yeah, I know I didn't post from there)

------------------------------
```

Date: 2 Jun 93 13:44:25
From: idacrd.ccr-p.ida.org!idacrd!n4hy@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Generate SSB using combined AM/FM?
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Bruce Toback says:

>In the ARRL publication "Solid State Design for the Radio Amateur," reference
>is made to generating an SSB signal by combining AM and FM: "...it may
>be shown mathematically that a carrier which is amplitude modulated properly
>and frequency modulated simultaneously will yield a single-sideband output."

>Unfortunately, the text gives no references, and my nearly-vanished knowledge
>of trigonometric identities is apparently not adequate to derive this result.
>Can anyone point me at some references and/or provide more information about
>the technique? How should the amplitude and phase of the carrier and
>modulating waveforms be adjusted to yield the desired sideband?

Consider "dividing" the phase and amplitude information into different
channels. Since filtered phase modulation can be thought of as frequency
modulation (the filtering makes the phase modulation process smooth) you
could then treat the phase channel as FM and amplify it using extremely
efficient class C,E, etc. amplifiers and at the same time heterodyne
it with carriers that are in quadrature and later remix to get `SSB' phase
modulation. The other channel, containing the amplitude information,
(detected envelope, or whatever) is amplified on a much lower efficiency,
but much less power hungry channel and then you `plate modulate' the

quadrature combined phase channels in the final amplifier with the
envelope channel to get the final product.

This quicky description of the phase channel and amplitude channel being
treated seperately is the heuristics behind "High Efficiency Linear
Amplification by Parametric Synthesis" by Karl Meinzer, DJ4ZC. It is
used in all of the `linear' transponders in AMSAT DL/NA built satellites.

Karl Meinzer once built a several kilowatt SSB amplifier that was almost
legal back in the days of power being described by DC Input.

Bob
--

Robert W. McGwier | n4hy@ccr-p.ida.org
Center for Communications Research | Interests: amateur radio, astronomy,golf
Princeton, N.J. 08520 | Asst Scoutmaster Troop 5700, Hightstown

---

Date: Wed, 2 Jun 1993 17:34:58 GMT
From: news.cerf.net!pagesat!spssig.spss.com!feenix.metronet.com!
marcbg@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: How do I obtain permission to operate 2m fm in Germany
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <9306021431.AA11755@nms1.abb.com> jennings@abb.COM writes:
>I hope to be going to Germany in late June and July and would like to
>bring my 2 meter hand held with me. Does anybody know what kind of
>permissions I need to operate? Is there any problem bringing my rig
>into and out of Germany? What kind of time frame is needed to obtain
>permission?
>Tom Jennings KV2X
>jennings@abb.com

Tom,

I lived in Germany for two years, so maybe my advice will help.

First, you are too late to apply for a temporary license, but you can
give it a try. Call the ARRL and tell them you want the reciprocal
licensing information for Germany. They will send you a sheet or two with
an application you have to send to the Deutsches Amateur Radio Club
(DARC). The DARC coordinates temporary permits for Germany. Mail the
information in ASAP, and write a note stating that you would like them to
rush. I don't know if this makes a difference, but it might.

If you are lucky enough to get the permit before you leave (highly

unlikely) then you'll sign a /DL or /DA on your American call depending upon your license grade. If you were going to be there a long time you could apply for a reciprocal license which is coordinated through the Deutsche Bundespost. I was DA2GM (even though the international callbook has been wrong for two years!)   :(

As for operating on two meters, all the repeaters have tone burst (1750 cycles) so you'll have to learn how to whistle to bring repeaters up. The Americans in Germany hang out on a simplex freqency, but I honestly don't remember what it is (I left about 10 months ago). It's 144. something I think. The two meter band is only 144-146 MHz, and 440 is 430-440 MHz.

Another thing - while most German Amateurs speak English, German is usually the only language heard on the repeaters.

As for getting the radio in and out of Germany, for right now, this should not be a problem. Make sure (especially if it's a new radio) that you take a copy of your receipt with you. There is a remote chance that you may get questioned by customs, but it's never happened to me.

Since you hardly have enough time to get the license, I'd recommend leaving the radio home. There's not that much activity you'll be able to understand (unless, like me, you speak some German) and you CERTAINLY don't want to be operating over there without a permit.

73 and best of luck

Marc, N5MEI

--

Date: Wed, 2 Jun 1993 15:32:53 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!gatech!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: HTX-202 birdies
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <mJ9g5B2w165w@nj8j.atl.ga.us> ben@nj8j.atl.ga.us (Ben Coleman) writes:
>bote@access.digex.net (John Boteler) writes:
>> plaws@uafhp.uark.edu (Peter Laws) writes:
>> >My Amiga (MC68000 + custom co-processors) has a HUGE spur at *exactly*
>> >146.76 MHz, which is, of course, the most active local repeater.
>> No problem.
>> Just change the frequency of the local repeater. :)
>

>Hah! Depending on the local 'repeater political' situation, it might be
>easier to arrange for Commodore to re-design the Amiga to eliminate the
>spur.

That might be even harder. The *harmonic* is from the 3.579 MHz color
burst frequency used in NTSC standard TV. Changing that would make
the Amiga's output incompatible with it's display system. One of the
real attractions of the Amiga is it's ability to generate NTSC standard
video. We use them in broadcast plants as cheap titling generators
among other things. BTW, nobody works the 146.76 machines from a
broadcast plant. There's enough 3.58 floating around to wipe out
any HT. Commodore *could* do a better shielding job, but HTs are
so sensitive that it's probably futile.

Gary

--
Gary Coffman KE4ZV | You make it, | gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems | we break it. | uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way | Guaranteed! | emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244 | |

Date: Wed, 2 Jun 1993 18:05:21 GMT
From: telesoft!garym@uunet.uu.net
Subject: HTX-202 mods
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In <1993Jun2.142505.26737@rsg1.er.usgs.gov> tbodoh@resdgs1.er.usgs.gov (Tom Bodoh)
writes:
>In article <9306011734.aa14703@cbda7.apgea.army.mil>,
wejones@cbda7.apgea.army.mil (Bill Jones) writes:
>|> > PS: Is it normal for the 202 to have a birde on 146.760?? Maybe that
>|> > is common?? cul

>|> I don't know about normal, but mine does it too. So does a friends. It
>|> is not picking up an external signal. BTW, it only is observed when the
>|> rubber ducky is used, ie when an external antenna is used, it goes away,
>|> so it seems to be an oscillation involving reactive components in the
>|> rubber ducky!

>It would be interesting to try the duckie from another brand of HT to see if
>the birdie moves or goes away altogether...

I have the "birdie" on my HTX-202. It's true disconnecting the rubber ducky
eliminates the noise. I tried 3 different rubber ducks and attaching any of
them will cause the noise to appear, I also tried a discone via 15' of RG-8

and I get there birdie with it also. So I don't think the rubber duck is
oscillating :-)

It's probably picking up some outside noise (like from a computer) and
mixing with internal noise or oscillators to produce the birdie on 146.76.

--GaryM
--
Gary Morris KK6YB   Internet: garym@alsys.com
San Diego, CA USA   Phone: +1 619-457-2700 x128 (work)

Date: Wed, 2 Jun 1993 15:01:07 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!gatech!kd4nc!
ke4zv!gary@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: IC 271/471 vs IC 275/475 Performance Question
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <1537@arrl.org> zlau@arrl.org (Zack Lau) writes:
>
>I've measured a IC-251A and its similar to the IC-202/402. The noise figure
>is around 6 dB and the dynamic range is 75 dB. (-134.5 dBm MDS).

Side note: I also have the IC-202/402 portables. Do you use the internal
batteries, or do you run them off an external gel cell to save weight?
I've started doing the latter, with the gell cell running the amp and
the computer too. It's a *big* gell cell that helps anchor the antenna
tripod.

>The Dec 1978 QST has a product review of the IC-211. The sensitivity was
>measured at .14 uV for 10 dB S+N/N. This was in the period in which the
>lab was just beginning to get decent test equipment.

Well, if I didn't screw up the math, always a possiblility with me,
then .14uV across 50 ohms is -124.067 dbm, call it -124. With that
for a 10 db S+N/N, and assuming linearity, then the MDS of the 211
should be around -134 dbm, about the same as the 251A. That matches
with my experience. With a dynamic range of 75 db, that leads to
an intercept of -59.5 dbm for the 251A. That's truly awful, and
my experience says the 211 is worse. The SBL-1 used on the Mutek
board has a rated intercept of around +5 dbm (my books aren't
handy, but that's in the ballpark). The BFxxx used on the Mutek
board doesn't have anywhere near 64 db of gain. I don't have a
spec on that circuit, but I'd guess it's around 15-20 db. So
I'd guess that the intercept of the 211 with Mutek board would
be on the order of -10 to -15 dbm. That's pretty strong for a
VHF rig. Other factors may limit it to less than that, but they'd

be common with the older circuitry. So it looks like the Mutek board buys about 44 db more dynamic range. This may be the wrong way to calculate this, Zack you can critique.

>This doesn't address the problem that most really low noise figure
>preamps have way too much gain--20 or 23 dB isn't unusual. One solution
>is to hack out the gain in front of the mixer, which isn't for everyone.

I've thought a bit about this. One obvious, but not too bright way to tame the preamp is to put a pad in it's output. But it seems to me that you could design the preamp to have less gain without hurting it's noise figure. Is this true, or do you have to optimize for noise figure and take whatever gain you get?

>This neglects the issue of what you really need. Sure, a noisy
>PLL rig is 40 dB worse than a good rig in terms of ultimate
>signal to noise ratio. But is this important if all you ever
>hear is the satellite (the transponders aren't noted for S/N radio--
>though most designers aren't faced with all the restrictions you have
>up in Space). Terrestrial interference can certainly be a problem--but
>a better receiver isn't the only solution. 432 EME has been made much
>easier by cleaning up antenna patterns. Perhaps the same might
>be true for satellite work.

With the Mutek equipped 211, and an ARR GASFET at the antenna, a KLM22C, I could watch the spin modulation of the noise floor of the transponder pump the S meter on the 211. That's as good as it gets since the transponder noise floor becomes the limiting factor.

I used to do another cheat, I took the scope output of the 211, IF frequency, and fed it to a IC745 in general coverage mode. This let me use the narrow filters in the 745 to get another effective NF improvement. Now, the FT736R already has the narrow filters available. One thing that limits the noise floor of the transponder is the bandwidth it has. A 200 kHz wide receiver isn't going to have the NF of a narrow rig.

Gary

--
Gary Coffman KE4ZV | You make it, | gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems | we break it. | uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way | Guaranteed! | emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244 | |

Date: Wed, 2 Jun 1993 15:56:08 GMT

From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!gatech!kd4nc!
ke4zv!gary@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Intermod/spurious sigs a common HT problem?
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <"1-Jun-93.11:20:40".*.PMcAfee.El_Segundo@Xerox.com>
kd6hr.El_Segundo@xerox.com writes:
>
>There seems to be a missunderstanding here. Intermod may come from a couple of
>sources. External generated intermod (most often at the repeater/remote site)
>and internal intermod generated in the receiver FRONT END ahead of the IF
>stages. The only thinges that will help here is bullet proof front rf-mixer
>stages (and lots of battery drain),   narrow band width filters at the antanna
>input or reduced sensitivity. Front end filters will help with out-of-band
>intermod but not in in-band-intermod. The point here is no matter how good the
>IF filtering is it won`t help the intermod. The damage is already done up
>front.

You're absolutely correct Pete. Triple conversion, with the first
conversion an *up* conversion, can get rid of birdies and images,
but it doesn't do diddle for intermod. The single best thing you
can do for intermod is a really stiff RF front end transistor,
say a CATV power transistor with at least 100 ma of standing
current. And follow that with a good high intercept DBM. But that's
not very feasible in a shirt pocket battery radio. So the second
line is good *narrow* preselector filtering ahead of the RF stage.
And that kills wide band scanning, and probably the shirt pocket
size as well. Reduced sensitivity is the last line of defense,
but with rubber dummy loads, that would limit range to pitifully
small areas.

You can have a good radio, or a scanner, but not both in shirt
pocket size.

Gary
--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV | You make it, | gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems | we break it. | uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way | Guaranteed! | emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244 | |

Date: Wed, 2 Jun 1993 18:51:07 GMT
From: pravda.sdsc.edu!news.cerf.net!usc!sdd.hp.com!col.hp.com!news.dtc.hp.com!
srgenprp!alanb@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Review of QRZ! CD-ROM
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Scott Cranston (cranston@zk3.dec.com) wrote:

:   Review of QRZ! Ham Radio CD-ROM
:   ------------------------------

: Fred Lloyd, AA7BQ, and a cast of contributing others has producted a
: CD-ROM with 500+ Mb of amateur radio related data, information and software.
..

I agree with what Scott said. The callsign database is up-to-date and
the retrieval software is VERY fast. What they do is include the entire
database 4 times sorted by name, call, city and zip. Format is straight
uncompressed ASCII, resulting in over 200 megabytes of storage. Since
space on a CD ROM is virtually free, this method works very well in the
CD-ROM format, but makes it inpractical to copy, unless you have a
VERY large hard disc!

The CD-ROM would be well worth the $15 just for the callsign database, but
there's lots of other interesting stuff as well, as Scott listed.
This is not your typical cheap CD-ROM with megabytes of "garbage" files
downloaded from some bulletin board.

The 00_INDEX.TXT file in the root directory contains a list of all the
files on the disc, most with short descriptions. Don't try to print out
the file, though, as it runs to over 1000 pages. (Anybody need any scrap
paper? :=) 98% of it is the rec.radio.amateur.* files, however (one file
per posting): If you print out the first 12 pages and last 16 pages,
you'll get all the rest. By the way, there is a program in the root
directory called CDF.EXE (CD Find) to search for keywords in the file
descriptions listed in the 00_INDEX.TXT file.

AL N1AL

Date: Wed, 2 Jun 1993 16:23:29 GMT
From: usc!cs.utexas.edu!swrinde!gatech!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary@network.UCSD.EDU
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <1993May31.235517.20113@w8hd.org>, <C7xEB2.I7G@olwejo.UUCP>,
<nagleC7zAqH.AHw@netcom.com>
Reply-To : gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman)
Subject : Re: Warning! FT5200 DANGER!

In article <nagleC7zAqH.AHw@netcom.com> nagle@netcom.com (John Nagle) writes:
>root@olwejo.UUCP (Bob Kupiec) writes:
>

>>In <1993May31.235517.20113@w8hd.org>, kenh@w8hd.org writes:
>>>To anyone with a Yaesu FT5200 with the 'wireless' mike option:
>>>DO NOT, *REPEAT*, DO NOT leave your radio on an unattended with this
>>>option installed.....any 49 MHz transmission in it's vicinity will be
>>>dutifully repeated through the radio and onto the air that is selected on
>>>the left frequency display.
>
>   I'm suprised they even market a "wireless mike" option like that.
>The unit is acting as a repeater, but it doesn't have any of the controls
>a repeater is required to have. No ID, no remote shutdown, etc.
>Should the FCC be asked to yank its type approval?

Well it's not a repeater under law. It's just operating with a Part 15
wireless control link. It's up to the licensee to maintain positive
control, and the radio offers that option with a jumper setting. The
only thing they do wrong IMHO is to not ship it that way by default.
To really use this thing to it's best advantage, however, a CTCSS
tone on the link would make it adequately secure and still allow
you to use it standing outside the car. I think it's mostly a gimmick,
however, and wouldn't buy one.

Gary
--
Gary Coffman KE4ZV | You make it, | gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems | we break it. | uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way | Guaranteed! | emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244 | |

Date: Wed, 2 Jun 1993 15:05:53 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!gatech!kd4nc!
ke4zv!gary@network.UCSD.EDU
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <1993May29.044220.18566@kd4nc.uucp>,
<1993May30.132502.11356@ke4zv.uucp>, <1udp6e$kla@access.digex.net>
Reply-To : gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman)
Subject : Re: Radio shack 2mtr ht, DTMF tone prob

In article <1udp6e$kla@access.digex.net> bote@access.digex.net (John Boteler)
writes:
>gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman) writes:
>>Many repeaters use a courtsey beep for this purpose, but if you're operating
>>simplex, letting the transmitter beep before dropping carrier is a good
>>way to simulate a verbal "over".
>
>Yeah.

>
>Why rely on good operating technique when the radio can save
>you the trouble!

For FM work, a conversational style is generally preferred. A
20-50 millisecond beep doesn't interrupt the flow of conversation
as much as the 500-700 ms word "over". It's also easier to pick
up if the signal is noisy, or the listening environment is noisy,
such as in a car. It also can't be forgotten, or mistaken by a
sudden signal drop below the squelch threshold. That's the reason
NASA uses it.

Gary
--
Gary Coffman KE4ZV | You make it, | gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems | we break it. | uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way | Guaranteed! | emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244 | |

Date: 2 Jun 1993 14:40:14 -0400
From: pravda.sdsc.edu!news.cerf.net!usc!wupost!udel!news.intercon.com!digex.com!
digex.net!not-for-mail@network.UCSD.EDU
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <1993May30.132502.11356@ke4zv.uucp>, <1udp6e$kla@access.digex.net>,
<1993Jun2.150553.22924@ke4zv.uucp>
Subject : Repeaters with those damned beeps

gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman) writes:
>bote@access.digex.net (John Boteler) writes:
>>Why rely on good operating technique when the radio can save
>>you the trouble!
>
>For FM work, a conversational style is generally preferred. A
>20-50 millisecond beep doesn't interrupt the flow of conversation
>as much as the 500-700 ms word "over". It's also easier to pick
>up if the signal is noisy, or the listening environment is noisy,
>such as in a car. It also can't be forgotten, or mistaken by a

None of these reasons bears out in practice. I have been riding
down the road listening to a repeater with a beep of some
description, hearing the conversation back and forth. Later,
upon turning up the volume I discovered it has a reset beep;
so much for noise immunity. I have also heard impatient hams
reply to a weak station who had momentarily dropped out of
the repeater's receiver long before any beep came around.

As I said originally, good operating technique obviates the
need for beeps. That's why I operate repeaters without beeps.

Simply replacing one noise with another doesn't really
make the repeater easier to use, plus it makes appliance
operators out of folks by insulating them from the actual
conditions on the repeater.

>sudden signal drop below the squelch threshold. That's the reason
>NASA uses it.

That seals it. In my experience, if NASA uses it, then
it CAN'T be a good idea.

--

bote@access.digex.net (John Boteler)
WARNING: You are subject to pre-emption!

Date: 2 Jun 1993 14:42:12 -0400
From: pravda.sdsc.edu!news.cerf.net!usc!elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!swrinde!cs.utexas.edu!
uwm.edu!spool.mu.edu!hri.com!noc.near.net!jericho.mc.com!levine@network.UCSD.EDU
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <2947977736.4.p00489@psilink.com>, <1uibpd$ci4@fugu.mc.com>,
<1993Jun2.175953.17562@midway.uchicago.edu>ool.mu.e
Subject : Re: Call Sign Server, Where?

In article <1993Jun2.175953.17562@midway.uchicago.edu>, hayward@cs.uchicago.edu
(Kristin R. Hayward) writes:
|>
|>
|> In article <1uibpd$ci4@fugu.mc.com> levine@mc.com (Bob Levine) writes:
|> :
|> :I tried the 2 servers listed and they worked fine, however the databases
|> :are way out of date. Dec 1991 I think they both were. I got this call
|> :in the mail on Jan 14, 1992 and it was not listed in either.
|> :
|> :callbook@sat.datapoint.com
|> :callsign.cs.buffalo.edu 2000
|> :
|> :Bob KD1GG
|>
|>

```
|> Something is strange here. Buffalo was updated a year ago spring.
|>
|> Here is your listing that Buffalo gave me a few minutes ago:
|>
|> % telnet electra.cs.buffalo.edu 2000
|> Trying 128.205.32.2 ...
|> Connected to electra.cs.buffalo.edu.
|> Escape character is '^]'.
|> Callbook v1.3  Bug reports to bowen@cs.buffalo.edu  Type 'help' for help
|> >> call kd1gg
|> Call-Sign: KD1GG                    Class: ADVANCED
|> Previously: KA1JFP                  Class: GENERAL
|> Real Name: ROBERT A LEVINE          Birthday: JAN 17, 1957
|>
|> and so on.....
|>
|>
|>
|> --
|> ------------------------------------------------------------------------
|> Kristin R. Hayward                University of Maine                WX9T
|> kristin@gandalf.umcs.maine.edu  (yeah, I know I didn't post from there)
```

Yes I am sorry, I quoted the wrong servers.

The servers posted by Mike Brand in the orignal post were:
callbook@sat.datapoint.com & (server run by email)
callbook@n8emr.cmhnet.org & (server run by email)
callsign.cs.buffalo.edu (access by telnet)

I only tried the first two with the call KD1GG issued to me on
Jan 14, 1992.

callsign.cs.buffalo.edu is a bit more up to date but still old, I
upgraded to Extra on June 10, 1992 and it doesn't show up.

Date: Wed, 2 Jun 1993 16:29:29 GMT
From: usc!wupost!csus.edu!netcom.com!mitchf@network.UCSD.EDU
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <C7z427.5MB@feenix.metronet.com>, <1uhk1jINNjc6@news.u.washington.edu>,
<1ui90d$ri1@cville-srv.wam.umd.edu>
Subject : Re: Best Mobile Dual-Band Rig?

ham@wam.umd.edu (Scott Richard Rosenfeld) writes:
>>Has anyone had any experiences with the Standard C5608DA? I like the

>>layout, but was wondering if it's a good radio. Standard isn't one of the
>>most common names I hear...

I bought the C5608DA about six months ago and LOVE it! Standard is known for rock-solid commercial grade gear, and the 5608 lives up to their reputation. This rig used to run close to $900 but can be found in the high $600's now. It doesn't come with a duplexer but I suppose the purists would rather have that outside the radio anyway rather than built in. I *highly* recommend this radio.

Mitch KC6VNF

--

                    O/   Cut here
--------------------Q\---

  Mitch, Super Dude.   "Go stick your head in a pig."

End of Info-Hams Digest V93 #671
****